

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-42 stand in the application. Claims 1, 26, and 42 are in independent form. Reconsideration is requested.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 14-19, 24-36, 28-32, 34-37 (including independent claims 1, 26, and 42) under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,104 to Cromer, rejected dependent claims 4, 8, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,840,441 to Monaghan, and rejected dependent claims 21, 22, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,857,716 to Nagahashi.

In this Response, Applicants amend at least independent claims 1, 26, and 42 to emphasize the distinctions over the cited prior art references, taken either alone or in combination.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Reconsideration is requested. In addition to the above amendments, the Applicants make the following remarks regarding individual issues:

### FEES DUE AND THE APPLICANTS' TIME TO RESPOND

The Office Action was mailed on January 13, 2010. The three-month initial deadline for responding without having to pay a penalty fee ended on April 13, 2010. The two-month extended deadline was June 13, 2010, which fell on a Sunday. Accordingly, the two-month extended deadline is June 14, 2010. Applicant therefore submits herewith a two-month extension fee.

## SPECIES ELECTIONS

No new claims are added in the current amendment. Additionally, each amended claim (except claim 19) remains unchanged within the same classification of species as previously suggested by the Examiner and elected by the Applicants. For example, independent claims 1, 26, and 42 were previously classified and suggested by the Examiner as generic. In this amendment, Applicants assert that the amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 remain generic as suggested by the Examiner and remain unchanged relating to their classification. Accordingly, each generic claim including independent claims 1, 26, and 42 remains generic as previously elected and is in condition for examination.

Claim 19 was previously classified as generic. Present amendment changes claim 19 from generic to Species B of Group 1. Upon allowance of any generic claims applicant will be entitled to consideration of claim 19.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the Examiner's §102 and §103 rejections. More specifically, Applicants have articulated their response as an element-by-element discussion of the multiple elements Applicants assert are patentable over the cited prior art.

### 1. Information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 26, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.6,483,104 to Cromer.

Applicants have amended at least each independent claim 1, 26, and 42 to recite:

. . . information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device. . .

Support for the above can be found for example in at least FIG. 1 and paragraphs [0016], [0074], [0080], and [0107] of the as-filed specification.

Cromer column 1 lines 63-67 and column 2 line 1 specifically teach and describe the following:

A data processing system and method are disclosed for permitting a portable computer to automatically detect the presence of a printer within a remote area, and responsive to the detection, automatically establishing a communications link with the printer. The portable computer is physically disconnected from the printer. (emphasis added)

Cromer does not teach nor suggest an “information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device.” Instead, Cromer explicitly teaches that “the portable computer is physically disconnected from the printer.” Following the teachings of Cromer, one skilled in the art will implement a structure whereby “the portable computer is physically disconnected from the printer” and NOT “information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device” as recited by each independent claim.

The explicit teachings of Cromer implement structurally the exact opposite of at least an element recited by currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Cromer itself cannot teach at least the “information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device.” Nor can it be combined with anything under §103 including Monaghan and Nagahashi to teach at least the “information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device.”

Independent claims 1, 26, and 42 each recite at least an element analogous to “information apparatus being physically connected directly to the output device.” This element alone is sufficient to distinguish independent claims 1, 26, and 42 from all cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent

claims 1, 26 and 42 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

**2. The direct structural connection between the information apparatus and the output device not including a network**

To further clarify the distinction over the cited references, Applicants have further amended at least independent claims 1, 26, and 42 to recite:

. . . the direct structural connection between the information apparatus and the output device not including a network. . .

Support for the above can be found for example in at least FIG. 1 and paragraph [0016] of the as-filed specification.

Cromer specifically teaches that the printer 108 is within a remote location from the portable computer 110 [Cromer, column 1 line 65], and that the communication between the portable computer 110 and printer 108 is thru a hub 102 utilizing a network bus [Cromer, FIG. 1 and column 3 line 21]. And the printer is connected to the network so that the portable computer can detect the printer [Cromer, FIG. 1, column 1 line 64, and column 3 lines 36-37].

Cromer does not teach nor suggest “the direct structural connection between the information apparatus and the output device not including a network” as recited by each independent claim. Instead, Cromer emphasizes the exact opposite by which the portable computer is connected to the network for communication with the printer. Further, as Cromer teaches to do the exact opposite, Applicants assert that Cromer cannot be combined with Monaghan and Nagahashi to cure the defect.

Independent claims 1, 26, and 42 each recite at least an element analogous to “the direct structural connection between the information apparatus and the output device not including a network.” This restriction alone is sufficient to distinguish the independent claims 1, 26, and 42 from all cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 are patentable. All

dependent claims depending from independent claims 1, 26 and 42 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

3. Providing from the output system .. an output device object that includes a security information to one or more servers over ... the Internet.

Moreover, Claim 1 has been further amended to recite:

. . . providing from the output system .. an output device object that includes a security information to one or more servers over . . . the Internet. . .

Support for the above can be found for example in at least FIGS. 6 and 9 and paragraph [0038] of the as-filed specification.

Neither Cromer, Monaghan, nor Nagahashi teach or describe anything akin to an output device object that includes a security information. Moreover, neither Cromer, Monaghan, nor Nagahashi describe or teach anything akin to “providing from the output system . . . an output device object that includes a security information . . . to one or more servers over . . . the Internet.”

Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claim 1 is patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 1 are patentable at least for depending from patentable independent claim 1.

4. a document object that includes at least part of the digital content, a reference to the digital content, or a pointer to the digital content

Independent claims 1, 26, and 42 has been further amended to recite:

. . . a document object that includes at least part of the digital content, a reference to the digital content, or a pointer to the digital content. . .

Support for the above can be found for example in at least FIGS. 6-9 and paragraphs [0033]-[0035], [0042], and [0043] of the as-filed specification.

Neither Cromer, Monaghan nor Nagahashi teach or describe an object. Moreover, neither Cromer, Monaghan nor Nagahashi teach or describe a document object that includes at least part of the digital content, a reference to the digital content, or a pointer to the digital content.

Independent claims 1, 26, and 42 each recite at least an element analogous to “a document object that includes at least part of the digital content, a reference to the digital content, or a pointer to the digital content.” Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 1, 26 and 42 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

**5. Receiving the digital content from the network at the output system in response to sending the said document object from the output system to the one or more servers over the network that includes the Internet**

In addition to the above distinctions, independent claims 1, 26, and 42 have been further amended to recite:

. . . receiving the digital content from the network at the output system in response to sending the said document object from the output system to the one or more servers over the network that includes the Internet. . .

Support for the above can be found for example in at least FIGS. 6- 9 and paragraphs [0033]-[0035], [0042], and [0043] of the as-filed specification.

Neither Cromer, Monaghan nor Nagahashi teach or describe a document object. Furthermore neither Cromer, Monaghan, nor Nagahashi teach or describe sending the “said document object from the output system to the one or more servers over the network that includes the Internet.” Moreover, neither Cromer, Monaghan, nor Nagahashi describe or teach “receiving the digital content from

the network at the output system in response to sending the said document object from the output system to the one or more servers over the network that includes the Internet.”

Independent claims 1, 26, and 42 each recite at least an element analogous to “receiving the digital content from the network at the output system in response to sending the said document object from the output system to the one or more servers over the network that includes the Internet.” Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 are patentable. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 1, 26 and 42 are patentable at least based on their dependency from patentable independent claims.

**6. An interface with a touch sensitive display screen for interacting with a user**

Independent claim 42 has been further amended to recite:

... an interface with a touch sensitive display screen for interacting with a user...

Support for the above element can be found for example in at least FIG. 9 and paragraphs [0048] and [00166] of the as-filed specification.

Neither Cromer, Monaghan nor Nagahashi describe or teach an interface with a touch sensitive screen for interacting with a user.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons offered above, Applicants assert that currently amended independent claim 42 is patentable as it recites at least an element not taught or disclosed by Cromer, Monaghan, and Nagahashi, either taken alone or in combination.

### CONCLUSION

In addition to the six distinctions described above, independent claims 1, 26, and 42 further recite one or more elements not explicitly discussed by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully assert that the additional distinctions over the cited references taken either alone or in combination shall be apparent after a reading of the listing of amended claims included herewith.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application as amended. For at least the foregoing distinctions 1 through 6 outlined above, the Applicants respectfully assert that currently amended independent claims 1, 26, and 42 are patentable as each recites at least an element not taught or suggested by Cromer, Monaghan or Nagahashi, taken either alone or in combination. All dependent claims depending from independent claims 1, 22, and 42 are patentable at least for depending from a patentable independent claim.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (360) 750-9931 if it appears that an additional interview would be helpful in advancing the case. The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the pending claims must be withdrawn, and that this application is in condition for allowance. Such is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jon C. Real/

---

JON C. REALI  
USPTO Reg. No. 54,391

RYLANDER & ASSOCIATES PC  
406 West 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660  
(360) 750-9931